

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Claims 1-29 are rejected.

Claims 1-16 and 18-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by El-Rafie. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reasons as set forth below.

To expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1. Claim 1 recites, in part, wherein the communications device can receive broadcast media content from the antenna and from the network, wherein the communications device can send the received broadcast media content and personal media content to the network, the personal media content being different from the received broadcast media content, wherein the communications device presents a plurality of media channels by which to access the received broadcast media content and the personal media content, and wherein the communications device pushes a selected media channel of the plurality of media channels over the network.

It is believed that El-Rafie, as alleged, does not describe at least these elements as set forth in claim 1. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to claims 1-16 and 18-22.

To expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 23. Claim 23 recites, in part, receiving, by the communications device, broadcast media content from the antenna and from the network; sending, by the communications device, personal media content and the received broadcast media content to the network, the personal media content being non-broadcast media content; presenting, by the communications device, a plurality of media channels by which to access the personal media content and the received broadcast media content; pushing, by the communications device, a selected media channel of the plurality of media channels over the network; receiving, by the communications device, a personal media channel that was pushed over the network; and updating the presented plurality of media channels to reflect the received pushed personal media channel.

U.S. Application No. 10/674,671, filed September 30, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 14827US02
Amendment accompanying RCE dated September 2, 2008
After Notice of Appeal received by USPTO on June 2, 2008

It is believed that El-Rafie, as alleged, does not describe at least these elements as set forth in claim 23. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to claims 23-29.

Claims 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over El-Rafie in view of Rakib. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the reasons as set forth below.

It is believed that the combination of El-Rafie and Rakib, as alleged, do not teach each and every element as set forth in claim 1 as discussed above. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn with respect to claim 17.

Applicants do not necessarily agree or disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the documents made of record, either alone or in combination, or the Examiner's characterization of recited claim elements. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue the characterization of the documents of record, either alone or in combination, to argue what is allegedly well known, allegedly obvious or allegedly disclosed, or the characterization of the recited claim elements should that need arise in the future.

With respect to the present application, Applicants hereby rescind any disclaimer of claim scope made in the parent application or any predecessor or related application. The Examiner is advised that any previous disclaimer of claim scope, if any, and the alleged prior art that it was made to allegedly avoid, may need to be revisited. Nor should a disclaimer of claim scope, if any, in the present application be read back into any predecessor or related application.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, to charge any fee deficiencies or to credit any overpayments to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held &

U.S. Application No. 10/674,671, filed September 30, 2003
Attorney Docket No. 14827US02
Amendment accompanying RCE dated September 2, 2008
After Notice of Appeal received by USPTO on June 2, 2008

Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Date: September 2, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael T. Cruz/
Michael T. Cruz
Reg. No. 44,636

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.
500 West Madison Street, Suite 3400
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000
Facsimile: (312) 775-8100